Amdt. dated February 22, 2006

Reply to Final Office Action dated November 30, 2005

REMARKS

At the outset, the Examiner is thanked for the thorough review and consideration of the pending application. The Final Office Action dated November 30, 2005 has been received and its contents carefully reviewed.

Claims 17 and 27 are hereby amended. Claims 1-23 and 26-33 are pending in the present application, with claims 1–16 being withdrawn from consideration.

In the Office Action, claims 17-19, 22, 27-29, and 32 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 6,788,374 to Ko et al. (hereinafter "Ko"); claims 22-23 and 33 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kim et al.; and claims 20-21, 26, and 30-31 are objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim.

In the Office Action, the Examiner states that claims 22-23 and 33 are rejected based on Kim et al. Applicants respectfully suggest that the Examiner meant to state that these claims are rejected based on Ko, and will respond accordingly below.

Applicants respectfully note the indication that claims 20–21, 26, and 30–31 contain allowable subject matter.

In the Office Action, claims 17-19, 22, 27-29, and 32 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by Ko. Applicants respectfully traverse the rejection of independent claim 17 and request reconsideration. Independent claim 17 is allowable in that it recites "a common auxiliary electrode in the pixel region corresponding the periphery of the pixel region and having a crossing portion crossing the pixel region, the crossing portion of the common auxiliary electrode being substantially parallel to the gate line for the entire length of the crossing portion and dividing the pixel region into at least two sub-regions." Nothing in Ko teaches or suggests at least this feature of the claimed invention. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully submit that claim 17, and its dependent claims 18-19 and 22, are allowable over Ko.

Applicants respectfully traverse the rejection of independent claim 27 and request reconsideration. Independent claim 27 is allowable in that it recites "a common auxiliary

Application No.: 10/603,766 Docket No.: 8733.832.00-US

Amdt. dated February 22, 2006

Reply to Final Office Action dated November 30, 2005

electrode in the pixel region corresponding the periphery of the pixel region and having a crossing portion crossing the pixel region, the crossing portion of the common auxiliary electrode being substantially parallel to the gate lines for the entire length of the crossing portion and dividing the pixel region into at least two sub-regions." Nothing in Ko teaches or suggests at least this feature of the claimed invention. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully submit that claim 27, and its dependent claims 28–29 and 32, are allowable over Ko.

In the Office Action, claims 22–23 and 33 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Ko. Applicants respectfully traverse the rejection of claims 22–23 and request reconsideration. Claims 22–23, which depend from independent claim 17, are allowable because Ko fails to teach or suggest at least the feature of claim 17 discussed above. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully submit that claims 22–23, as they depend from claim 17, are allowable over Ko.

Applicants respectfully traverse the rejection of claim 33 and request reconsideration. Claim 33, which depends from claim 27, is allowable because Ko fails to teach or suggest at least the feature of claim 27 discussed above. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully submit that claim 33, as it depends from claim 27, is allowable over Ko.

Applicants believe the foregoing amendments place the application in condition for allowance and early, favorable action is respectfully solicited.

If for any reason the Examiner finds the application other than in condition for allowance, the Examiner is requested to call the undersigned attorney at (202) 496-7500 to discuss the steps necessary for placing the application in condition for allowance. All correspondence should continue to be sent to the below-listed address.

Application No.: 10/603,766 Docket No.: 8733.832.00-US

Amdt. dated February 22, 2006

Reply to Final Office Action dated November 30, 2005

If these papers are not considered timely filed by the Patent and Trademark Office, then a petition is hereby made under 37 C.F.R. §1.136, and any additional fees required under 37 C.F.R. §1.136 for any necessary extension of time, or any other fees required to complete the filing of this response, may be charged to Deposit Account No. 50-0911. Please credit any overpayment to deposit Account No. 50-0911. A duplicate copy of this sheet is enclosed.

Dated: February 22, 2006

Respectfully submitted,

Eric J. Nuss

Registration No.: 40,106

MCKENNA LONG & ALDRIDGE LLP

1900 K Street, N.W. Washington, DC 20006

(202) 496-7500

Attorneys for Applicant